



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,986	10/29/2003	Masaharu Nagai	12732-171001	5334

26171 7590 04/05/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

CHACKO DAVIS, DABORAH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1756

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,986

Applicant(s)

NAGAI ET AL.

Examiner

Daborah Chacko-Davis

Art Unit

1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 17, 18 and 20-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 17, 18 and 20-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 9-11, 20-27, and 32-35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 4,646,424 (Parks et al., hereinafter referred to as Parks) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,009,888 (Ye et al., hereinafter referred to as Ye).

Parks, in col 2, lines 59-68, in col 3, lines 1-10, in col 6, lines 3-59, a method of forming a semiconductor device by forming a gate electrode on a substrate, forming a positive resist pattern (the resist is photosensitive, contains a photosensitizer) on the gate material film (metal layer), plasma etching (dry etching) the gate material film exposed using the resist pattern as the mask, removing the remaining resist material by using a stripper (stripping the remaining resist, resist removing process, a resist stripper dissolves and removes the remaining resist) (claims 1-4). Parks, in col 1, lines 8-11, and in col 2, lines 59-65, discloses that the metal film is a titanium film and the titanium forms a gate electrode material in a thin film transistor (claims 9-11, and 24-27). Parks, in col 6, lines 5-7, discloses that the substrate material is glass (claims 20-23).

The difference between the claims and Parks is that Parks does not disclose irradiating the resist residuals, remaining on the pattern after the stripping process, with light. Parks does not disclose that after the dry etch processes (more than one dry etch

Art Unit: 1756

process) the resist pattern is irradiated with light. Parks does not disclose that that light irradiated has multiple wavelengths as recited in claims 32-35.

Ye, in the abstract, and in col 5, lines 1-67, and in col 6, lines 1-35, discloses that after the dry etching processes and resist stripping processes, an irradiation is performed on the resist pattern and/or the resist residue remaining on the pattern structure formed (metal or insulating patterns), with laser. Ye, in col 5, lines 51-55, discloses that the photoresist pattern is irradiated with a UV in the claimed range.

Therefore, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Parks by employing the method of irradiating the resist pattern after dry etch processes using wavelengths in the claimed range, and/or stripping processes as suggested by Ye because Ye, in col 4, lines 33-34, discloses that irradiating the residues remaining or photoresist pattern (remaining after dry etch processes) with laser is a synergetic effect that is superior to conventional strip processes, and Ye, in col 5, lines 51-57, discloses that irradiating the photoresist pattern in the claimed range of wavelengths result in the partial removal of the polymer and the photoresist without damaging the underlying layers or substrate, and Ye, in col 6, lines 25-26, discloses that laser removes all the polymers and resist remaining on the structure.

3. Claims 5-8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 4,646,424 (Parks et al., hereinafter referred to as Parks) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,009,888 (Ye et al., hereinafter referred to as Ye) as applied to claims 1-4,

Art Unit: 1756

9-11, and 20-27 above, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,645,851 (Ho et al., hereinafter referred to as Ho).

Parks in view of Ye is discussed in paragraph no. 3.

The difference between the claims and Parks in view of Ye is that Parks in view of Ye does not disclose the photosensitizer recited in claims 5-8.

Ho, in the abstract, and in col 4, lines 1-19, discloses that the photoresist composition used for forming the photoresist pattern mask is a novolac type resin that includes a photosensitizer such as diazonaphthoquinone compound.

Therefore, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Parks in view of Ye by employing the photoactive compound (photosensitizer) suggested by Ho in the photoresist composition because Ho, in col 9, lines 43-54, discloses that adding the claimed photosensitizer (DNQ) in the photoresist composition enables the use of the formed photoresist composition (novolac resin + DNQ) in wavelengths such as 300nm to about 500nm, and also aids in the lowering of the melt temperature of the formed photoresist layer below the glass transition temperature of the novolac resin.

4. Claims 17-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 4,646,424 (Parks et al., hereinafter referred to as Parks) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,009,888 (Ye et al., hereinafter referred to as Ye) as applied to claims 1-4, 9-11, and 20-27 above, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 4,816,115 (Hörner et al., hereinafter referred to as Hörner).

Parks in view of Ye is discussed in paragraph no. 3.

The difference between the claims and Parks in view of Ye is that Parks in view of Ye does not disclose the exposure period of time recited in claims 17, and 18.

Hörner, in col 5, lines 25-30, discloses that the photoresist is exposed to radiation for about 3 seconds.

Therefore, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Parks in view of Ye by employing the exposure range suggested by Hörner because Hörner, in col 5, lines 30-52, discloses that adjusting the exposure time to a desired duration enables the tailoring of the desired edge angle of the photoresist pattern formed.

5. Claims 28-31, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 4,646,424 (Parks et al., hereinafter referred to as Parks) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,009,888 (Ye et al., hereinafter referred to as Ye) as applied to claims 1-4, 9-11, and 20-27 above, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 4,673,808 (Katohno et al., hereinafter referred to as Katonho).

Parks in view of Ye is discussed in paragraph no. 3.

The difference between the claims and Parks in view of Ye is that Parks in view of Ye does not disclose that the resist stripper has a mixture of 2-aminoethanol and a glycol ether (claims 28-31).

Katohno, in col 5, lines 20-28, and lines 65-67, discloses the use of a Nagase stripper solution (Nagase N-series stripper solution is blend of aminoethanol and glycol ether) to remove the remaining resist pattern (after etch processes).

Therefore, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Parks in view of Ye by employing the stripper solution suggested by Katohno because Parks in col 6, lines

55-59, teaches using a resist stripper to remove the remaining resist material and Katohno, in col 5, lines 1-30, discloses that using the claimed resist stripper (Nagase stripper solution) enables the removal of the resist by releasing thus avoiding the presence of the residual portions of the resist pattern on the metal plate to be patterned.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed January 12, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The 103 rejections made in the previous office action (paper no. 20060926) are maintained.

A) Applicants argue that neither Parks nor Ye teaches the removal of the resist pattern with a resist stripper.

Ye is not depended upon to disclose the use of a resist stripper to remove the resist pattern. Parks, in col 6, lines 58-60, teaches using a resist stripper to remove the remaining resist material from the substrate.

B) Applicants argue that Parks does not describe irradiation of a residue of a resist pattern with a light after removing the resist pattern and removing the residue of the resist pattern with a developer.

Parks teaches using a resist stripper to remove the remaining resist material (resist pattern after etching the gate material). Parks is not relied upon to disclose the irradiation and developer use after the stripping process. Ye, in col 5, lines 1-57, is relied upon to disclose the removal of the polymer residue of the photoresist after the etch processes, wherein the residue is removed by UV irradiation and the immersing of the treated substrate in an oxidizing bath (developer).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daborah Chacko-Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 - 6:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark F Huff can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

Art Unit: 1756

more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dcd

MD
April 2, 2007.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark F. Huff", with a stylized flourish at the end.

MARK F. HUFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700